



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,636	03/29/2007	Georg Curtius	2003P01781WOUS	3583
46726 7590 11/24/2008 BSH HOME APPLIANCES CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 100 BOSCH BOULEVARD NEW BERN, NC 28562				
EXAMINER WALDBAUM, SAMUEL A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1792				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/24/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/583,636

Applicant(s)

CURTIUS ET AL.

Examiner

SAMUEL A. WALDBAUM

Art Unit

1792

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 September 2008 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In the reply filed August 27, 2008 the applicant has amended claims 11 and 16. The previous rejection is hereby withdrawn in favor of the new rejection found below.
2. The applicant further amended the Specification and Drawings in the supplemental response filed on September 2, 2008.

Double Patenting

3. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

4. Claims 11 and 12 provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 11 and 12 of copending Application No. 10/583697. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In the amended specification filed, September 2, 2008 the new paragraphs reference number 12, however no number is found in the figures.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the subject matter of claims 11 (the washing container, structure for introduction of cleaning agent, fluid carrier), 16 (the base of the container and where the sensor is located), 18 (the shape of the sensor) and 19 (the spray arm, the relationship with the sensor, and how the sensor is protected) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. Claim 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The amended claim 11 now requires "a washing step, rinsing step and a drying step, wherein the washing step includes introduction of a cleaning agent and a fluid carrier forming a washing fluid and the rinsing step includes a introduction of a rinsing fluid". However no support is found in the original or amended specification to provide support for the amendment to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 11-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wennerberg et al (U.S. 3,539,153) in view of Adamski et al (U.S. 4,982,606, hereafter '606).

10. Claims 11-14: '153 teaches a dishwasher (col. 1, lines 1-7) with a chamber for the dishes (col. 2, lines 40-75), with a washing, rinsing and drying steps (col. 3, lines 5-20), with a cleaning agent dispenser (col. 4, lines 40-55) and a fluid carrier (col. 2, lines 45-55), with capacitance fluid level sensors (col. 2, lines 55-75) a circuit connected to the sensor (col. 2, line 40-col. 4, line 55), where it is inherent how a capacitance level sensor works by changing its capacitance based of the dielectric change based off the level of the water. '153 teaches using multiple sensors to determine height, not just one and does not specify the shape of the sensor. '606 is a fluid level sensor. '606 teaches a rectangular sensor composed of 2 capacitive plates (fig. 2, sensor plates, part 50 and 52 are rectangular) and that the sensor can detect multiple heights of the fluid based of the dielectric constant which changes with the depth of the water (col. 4, lines 40-69, col. 6, line 50-col. 7 line 69) allowing one sensor to detect multiple heights. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have use the rectangular sensor taught by '606 in apparatus '153 to detect multiple levels of height of the fluid, thus reducing the number of fluid level sensor to one. Claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished form prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Danly*, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA). "[A]pparatus claims cover what a devices is not what a device does" *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

11. Claim 15: '153 teaches the use of multiple sensor arranged specific heights in the tub (col. 2, lines 60-70).

12. Claims 16 and 19: `153 does not specify how the dishes are cleaned. The examiner takes official notice that is common to use a spray arm to spray water on to the dishes thus the dishes are cleaned. `153 teaches that the capacitance level sensors are mounted in a manner to detect the level of the water at different heights, low, medium and high (col. 2, lines 30-75). `606 teaches that the sensor is protected from the water source where the mounting points and circuits are protected from direct contact with the water (fig. 1, the water source, parts 24, 26 and 28, the sensor part 48, which is protected from the water being directly sprayed on the sensor by the tub, part 14). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have place the low sensor in the base to detect the low level of water where it is not directly hit by the spray arm to have protected the circuit from direct contact with the fluid and only the probes projected in to the washing container as taught by `153 in view of `606 since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70.

Claim 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wennerberg et al (U.S. 3,539,153) in view of Adamski et al (U.S. 4,982,606) as applied to claim 11 above further in view of Kuechler (U.S. 6,294,906, hereafter `906).

`153 and `606 teaches all the limitations of claim 11 above.

13. Claim 20: `153 teaches that the sensor can be mounted in a manner to sense the water level (col. 2, lines 30-75) but just does not state exactly how it is mounted. `606 teaches a mounting the sensor with fasteners (col. 5, lines 1-67). `906 is solving the same problem as the applicant of mounting a sensor in a secure fashion. `906 teaches using an adhesive to mount the sensor to a support (col. 3, lines 30-45). All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art

and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, meaning that an adhesive taught by '906 can be used on the capacitance level sensor in apparatus '153 in view of '606 to have yield the predictable result of securing the sensor the support.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed September 2, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

15. Applicant is arguing that there is no reason to replace the multiple capacitive sensors as taught by '153 with the capacitive level sensor of '606. However as stated above in the rejection, a single capacitive level sensor can detect multiple heights of the liquid based of the dielectric constant of the water as taught by '606, thus replace multiple sensor with a singular sensor. Thus it is within the skill level of one ordinary skill in the art to replace multiple sensor with a singular sensor.

16. See above new rejection for above placing the sensor in the bottom of the dishwasher chamber.

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SAMUEL A. WALDBAUM whose telephone number is (571)270-1860. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TR 6:20-3:50, F 6:30-10:30 est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Cleveland can be reached on 571-272-1418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. A. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/FRANKIE L. STINSON/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792